

from page 667 of the budget under the table entitled "Analysis of 1965 financing." I might also point out that the figure includes what is known as selected resources which have increased from less than \$4 million in 1963 to over \$40 million for 1965. Even these figures vary widely from year to year and for the same year depending upon which budget year is under consideration, as shown in the following table, which I include at this point in the Record:

Analysis of selected resources
(In millions of dollars)

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
In 1963 budget.....	4,041	13,230	-5,414	-----	-----
In 1964 budget.....	-----	9,076	-4,276	11,727	-----
In 1965 budget.....	-----	-----	3,475	5,910	40,004

The committee feels that the recommended \$80 million for fiscal year 1965 which is \$29 million above the 1964 appropriation will be sufficient to procure all the items which require authorization in the President's budget, and is in consonance with the President's public announcement of his desire that the program be held within the budget. It is most desirable and advantageous to provide for a level and consistent program of modernization and replacement rather than substantial increases and decreases from year to year with resulting displacement of personnel and other program modifications.

As I pointed out on the floor of the House, the committee is fully in sympathy with the program to provide for a modern and effective Coast Guard and has insisted that formal plans for that purpose be developed and presented to the committee. Those plans have all been provided now and are approved, and the committee intends to see that they are accomplished.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Committee on Rules in support of my bill (H.J. Res. 145) to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. I commend the committee for holding hearings and hope that a rule will be granted.

House Joint Resolution 145 is identical to a bill which I introduced in May of 1961—House Joint Resolution 418 of the

87th Congress. At that time there was a great hue and cry for an investigation of the Central Intelligence Agency. The disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion had just taken place, and there was general agreement that the CIA did not function properly. The furor over the Bay of Pigs has subsided, and so has criticism of the CIA. But we cannot forget that the Bay of Pigs was the result of permitting a secret Government organization, which is not even subject to the usual congressional budgetary scrutiny, to conduct its own foreign policy. There is a saying that those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

We did repeat it. In South Vietnam the role of the CIA once again indicated the need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. Under the Diem regime the Government of South Vietnam conducted a ruthless campaign of religious persecution. The special forces of Col. Le Quang Tung were used by the Government not to fight the Vietcong but to suppress the people of South Vietnam. I am sure that we all remember the series of bloody raids on Buddhist pagodas which took place last summer. These raids were led by Colonel Tung's special forces. On September 10, 1963, the New York Times reported that the CIA paid as "direct under-the-table aid" \$3 million a year for the salaries and maintenance of these special forces. And these special forces were the very forces which were undermining U.S. policy in this critical area.

Diem is now gone, and we have a new regime in South Vietnam. There is no doubt that the CIA is still active in that area. What it is doing is a total mystery to almost every Member of Congress. How much money it is spending in this and other areas is also a mystery.

I use Vietnam and Cuba merely as examples of the dual role of intelligence gathering and actual foreign policy formulation which has characterized the CIA from its very beginning. I do not deny the need for the Central Intelligence Agency. In the world in which we live we must have an agency of Government which gathers as much intelligence concerning other countries as can possibly be acquired. But that agency cannot and should not formulate and execute foreign policy decisions—the province under our democratic system of the elected officials of the United States.

My bill, House Joint Resolution 145, would establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. The committee would be composed of seven Members of the Sen-

ate and seven Members of the House to be appointed respectively by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. The joint committee would make continuing studies of:

First. The activities of each information and intelligence agency of the United States;

Second. The problems relating to the foreign information and intelligence programs; and

Third. The problems relating to the gathering of information and intelligence affecting the national security, and its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States.

The bill specifically excludes the FBI from the scope of the joint committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconsistent with the basic concepts of our democratic government to allow a large and extremely important agency to avoid the scrutiny of the people's representatives by hiding behind the cloak of secrecy. The Congress and the people have a right to know and a right to regulate the intelligence services of this Nation.

I hope that all Members of Congress who are concerned about the activities of the CIA will join me in urging the Committee on Rules to grant a rule. The establishment of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence is long overdue.

INADEQUACIES OF NEW TAX WITHHOLDING TABLES

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include certain tables.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, enactment of the tax bill has caused a new series of tax withholding tables to be put into effect and I rise today to point out to my good friends, particularly those in the lower income brackets that the withholding of taxes is inadequate for this taxable year 1964. While normally a workingman would expect to have a sufficient amount withheld to pay his entire tax at the end of the year and possibly qualify him for a refund, in more cases than not we will find at the end of the taxable year 1964 many, many of our people having to come up with additional sums to make up for the balance of their tax for the year 1964. This was brought to my attention by my very good friend, George E. Morgan, a certified public accountant with the firm Morgan, Ellis & Co. in Peoria, Ill. The table which he has prepared points this out very clearly and under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the tables at this point in the Record:

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7415

their information. This is about roads going from Alaska through Canada and the United States and going down to South America. This is an important thing for us to do and I think we ought to do it. I see no objection to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks that I made in the Committee of the Whole, and I also ask that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at that point in the Record extending congratulations to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] on his birthday tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WHEAT-COTTON BILL

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on the day we considered and passed the wheat-cotton bill, I received the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 7, 1964.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You will soon vote on H.R. 6196, the wheat-cotton bill. This bill is bad for farmers, consumers, and taxpayers and we urge you to vote no.

Farm Bureau has over 1,628,000 member farm and ranch families in 2,700 counties. I know I speak for our entire membership when I deplore efforts to make the wheat-cotton bill a partisan issue.

The wheat section is almost identical to the multiple price bread tax plan voted down overwhelmingly by wheat farmers last May.

The cotton section involves two additional subsidies, including one to the mills and the other in form of compensatory (Brannan type) payments to producers. It will cost taxpayers at least another \$300 million annually.

Most farmers have already completed plans for 1964 plantings of both wheat and cotton and passage of this legislation will have only a disruptive effect.

We earnestly urge you to vote against this bill not only for the good of farmers, consumers and taxpayers, but to help preserve our efficient private enterprise system.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

I think Mr. Shuman is in error. Failure to pass the wheat-cotton bill would have resulted in drastically depressing prices to the farmer and reducing farmer purchasing power by many hundreds of millions. The whole economy would have been seriously impaired.

This bill was the best we could do especially inasmuch as the Senate could not reconsider its action before planting time would be long past.

What is more, the consumers would have realized no saving. For instance, a drop in wheat prices by 70 cents per bushel would not bring a decrease in bread prices. According to baking companies, at \$2 to \$2.25 per bushel wheat, a 25-cent loaf of bread contains only approximately 2½ cents worth of wheat.

Thus without the bill the wheat farmer would lose at least 70 cents per bushel, the miller and baker would get the windfall, and the consumer would still pay the same price for bread.

I think we should have had a larger subsidy per bushel for the farmer, but this bill is the best compromise we could get the Congress to pass. So I voted for the bill and thus did the best available for all concerned.

COAST GUARD

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include certain tables.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, during the debate on the Coast Guard section of the Treasury, Post Office, and executive office appropriation bill, 1965 (H.R. 10532), my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office, Mr. VAUGHAN GARY, stated that at the end of the present fiscal year the Coast Guard would have unobligated \$43,942,000 of the amount appropriated last year. I found the statement very disturbing because our study of the Coast Guard's needs during hearings on the authorization bill did not reveal such a prospect.

Since completion of the action of the House on the appropriation bill I have inquired into the situation and find that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] had been misinformed as to the facts.

At the end of March there remained slightly over \$16 million of fiscal 1964 funds unobligated, which during the balance of the fiscal year will be reduced by approximately another \$10 million, leaving a balance of funds to be carried over, but planned for obligation in fiscal year 1965, estimated at \$6,402,754.

The sum which will be unobligated at the end of the current fiscal year represents funds required for acquisition, construction, and improvement items presently in process but not scheduled for completion until next year, or even later. In the normal course of doing business the obligation of these funds will be made during future stages in the progress of projects now underway. For example, obligations were incurred during the month of January 1964 for the construction of the hull and machinery of a high endurance cutter. The construction of a major vessel can take as much as 2 years or more to complete, and there are many items of outfit and equipment that are, under good practice, not procured until the major construction work is well advanced. Therefore, some of the funds appropriated for the construction and equipping of such a vessel must await obligation until 1965.

There is set forth below the correct figures reflecting the actual unobligat-

ed balances at the end of December 1963 and at the ends of January, February, and March 1964, plus a projection of the unobligated balances remaining at the ends of April, May, and June 1964, based upon firmly planned obligations during the fourth quarter.

I include in the RECORD the following table which will reflect these facts:

Appropriation: Acquisition, construction, and improvements, Coast Guard

Funds available for obligation:

Unobligated funds, June 30, 1963.....	\$9,222,525
Appropriation, fiscal year 1964.....	51,000,000
Total funds available for obligation in 1964.....	60,222,525

Unobligated balances through 3rd quarter, fiscal 1964:	
On Dec. 31, 1963.....	36,712,236
On Jan. 31, 1964.....	25,403,174
On Feb. 29, 1964.....	24,572,372
On Mar. 24, 1964.....	22,657,245
On Mar. 31, 1964.....	16,214,040
Unobligated balances after planned obligations during 4th quarter, fiscal 1964:	
On Apr. 30, 1964.....	13,989,566
On May 31, 1964.....	9,223,114
On June 30, 1964.....	6,402,754

* This balance is planned for obligation in fiscal 1965.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] who is chairman of the subcommittee handling this particular appropriation be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements" for the U.S. Coast Guard provides funds for the major capital expenditures of the Coast Guard in connection with modernization and replacement of vessels, aircraft, and shore installations. This appropriation is known as a "no year" appropriation—meaning that the funds may be carried over from year to year until expended, and do not revert to the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year as do normal appropriations. In addition, any amounts that are deobligated pursuant to changes in the program as well as amounts below estimates remain in the account to be used for other projects as required.

The committee realizes that capital expenditures under these programs must of necessity fluctuate from time to time and that accurate and positive forecasts of costs and balances cannot be made due to the long leadtime necessary for procurement of such major items as cutters and other large vessels and aircraft. Consequently, the committee has never considered it proper to base its appropriation recommendations on estimates of unobligated balances, and the committee did not do so in its recommendation for fiscal year 1965. The committee has never seen fit to reduce or rescind the unobligated balances in this appropriation, because such balances provide a necessary and desirable margin for the proper operation of the program.

The figure of \$43,942,000 which I mentioned during the debate on the bill came

Approved For Release 2006/07/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600130008-0

Page Denied